



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PAULINE MANUSCRIPTS F AND G.

A TEXT-CRITICAL STUDY.

By WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH,
Tulane University.

I.

THE relationship of the Græco-Latin codices Augiensis and Boernerianus has long been a matter of serious and interesting consideration. Wetstein (1752), who designated them by the letters F and G, and who set little store by them, held G to be a copy of F; "*animadverti autem, istum codicem non esse nisi apographon praece-dentis (F, seu Augiensis).*" However, he has no quarrel with him who would invert the kinship, but would merely say that the collateral order, as in F, seems to be more ancient than the interlinear in G. To this judgment Matthäi (1792) assents ("*verissime, ut arbitror, iudicat Wetstenius*"), but does not investigate the matter. Semler (1769) controverted Wetstein's view in two pages of critical observations. Michaelis (1788) reserved his judgment, but held it undeniable that the Greek of G had been altered to suit the Latin. Kusterus (1710) at first entertained no doubt of this corruption, but toward the last he seemed to waver, as the most striking examples yielded to other explanations. Scrivener (1859) rejected the notion that either codex can be a copy of the other, on the basis of the diversity between F and G in the grouping of letters into words. Tregelles assented to Scrivener's view, and Tischendorf more positively. Hort, following the suggestion of Westcott, came to the conclusion, as the result of an apparently hasty and superficial examination, that F was almost certainly only a bad copy of G. Corssen (1887) in two learned and interesting contributions returned to Scrivener's view and accentuated his reasons, but hardly added any new ones. Zimmer (1887, 1890) took the opposite position and professed to raise to certainty the dictum of Hort. He also criticised Corssen incisively. Riggenbach (1893) and Zahn (1897) accept Zimmer's "proof" with eagerness and dismiss F from the court of criticism, just as E is rejected as only a poor reproduction of D. Nestle, however, still abides by the older theory.

The question is not merely academic. The Græco-Roman trio D F G, representing the Occidental Text of Griesbach, has long been overshadowed by the more venerable Alexandrines; but criticism is

coming to perceive more and more clearly that they do not deserve such step-motherly treatment, that their testimony cannot be dismissed or discounted in such cavalier fashion. Just *because* they have not back of them the learning and critical sagacity of Alexandria, they may often, very often, present an earlier and less sophisticated text. This is particularly true of F and G, and hence it has been thought "worth while" to institute an independent investigation of the supposed kinship of the codices, and to shrink from no painstaking that may define or certify the results.

In the conduct of this investigation, it will be necessary, first, to examine dispassionately but critically the considerations adduced by Zimmer.¹ But even if these be found to have overwhelming weight, it will still be indispensable to inquire whether there is anything to throw into the opposite scale; for the correct theory must explain all the facts in the case, these as well as those. Occasion may arise to distinguish the manuscripts from the scribes themselves; these latter then we shall designate by F* and G*; the correctors may be denoted by F** and G**; the originals of F and G may be denoted by F' and G'; the originals of these by F'', G''; and so on.

The first, and at first sight one of the most plausible, of Zimmer's arguments is based on 1 Thess. 5 : 24. In order to present the whole case with perfect clearness, we shall here and elsewhere give the G text and immediately under it the F text, the supposed copy.

<i>iesu christi</i>	<i>fidelis + deus qui vocat vos qui</i>
ἰϰ χρν. τηρηθει. √ H.	πιστοσ. ο. καλων υμασ. οσ
παρουσία. του. κυ. ημων. ἰϰ. χρν.	ventu dñi nri ihu xpi
O. πιστοσ. ο κα	servetur. Fidelis ds qui voca

Now, says Zimmer, the F scribe overlooked the hook √ by which G sought to correct his mistake in separating H from τηρηθει; he also conceived H as the feminine article; he also perceived it could not go with the masculine πιστοσ; he accordingly corrected it into O; then τηρηθει became unintelligible; and he left a blank to be filled out, perhaps from some other manuscript.

This is certainly most ingenious—Zimmer says there is no other way to explain the facts—and yet on close inspection it turns out to be a tissue of incredibilities. Here are six suppositions; not one is probable, four are almost impossible. If F has really copied G, then he has observed throughout, on every page and in almost every line, the

¹ In HILGENFELD'S *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1887), pp. 76-91, and in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1890), No. 3, cols. 59-62.

minutest peculiarities of his original; Zimmer indeed holds that he has produced a photographic likeness. He has noticed the most inconspicuous dots, of which there are scores, and yet we must suppose him to have overlooked the conspicuous hook. Especially does this seem improbable, since on Zimmer's hypothesis he was so puzzled over the passage as to change part of the text and leave the rest unwritten! This he could not have done without close attention, and close attention could not fail to see the manifest hook. Nor can we say he saw, but did not understand; for he himself has used it thousands of times — nine times on this very page. True, he might have conceived Η as the feminine article, but he might just as well have conceived it as a relative, or conjunction, or subjunctive; and most likely he would not have conceived it at all; for his knowledge of Greek was too defective for him to bother over this continually recurring letter. But that he perceived that it could not go with the masculine *πιστος* is quite incredible, and equally so that he would correct it into the masculine Ο. For there is no example, in 248 pages, of his taking any such offense or making any such correction, though grammatical impossibilities of every variety swarm in these pages by hundreds. Seven lines farther on he writes *πασὶν τοὺς ἀδελφοῖς*, and again *πρὸς θεσσαλονικαίων*. That he was not startled by the apparition of Η in the most impossible positions is plain from such examples as these: *η. μαρτον*, Rom. 3:23; *η. ὑξανε*, 1 Cor. 3:6; and the like in number. In these cases the G text is clear and correct; if F copied it, he must have deliberately introduced these absurdities.

Once more, that *τηρηθῇ* then "became" unintelligible to him and *therefore* was omitted is doubly unbelievable. To be sure, in all likelihood he could not understand the word, but neither did he understand a large fraction of what he put down with scrupulous fidelity, and there is no example of his omitting anything because he did not understand it. No one could understand hundreds or thousands of his combinations, but they are all written off with consummate care. Such are *οἰλο·ποι* and *·περ·ῆ· ὠδευες*, on the preceding page (210), and countless others.

Moreover, that the F scribe should have taken offense at the absence of *η* from *τηρηθῇ* is a sheer impossibility. If he really missed it and was so troubled about it, why did he not see it in the Η immediately following and connected by the hook? But could he have been so troubled? Certainly not! For his knowledge of Greek was most elementary, not enough to keep him right in the simplest cases, numbers, or persons; how then could he have known so well the third

person singular of the first aorist optative passive? The fact is that the terminations ϵ , ι , $\epsilon\iota$, $\alpha\iota$, and the letters η , ϵ were to him almost exactly equivalent; he uses them almost indiscriminately. It is more absurd to suppose he would hesitate at the form $\tau\eta\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota$ than to suppose a German, as little versed in English, would hesitate at the word "employe" and refuse to transcribe it because not written properly "employee." Of this conclusion we are made absolutely certain by his treatment of the exactly parallel form $\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\eta$ (2 Tim. 4: 16). Here G writes

illis imputetur t imputatum sit
 $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota$ η . and F $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$. $\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota$. η ^v. *lis imputetur.*

Whence it is plain that even G* did not understand this termination $\theta\epsilon\iota\eta$, but thought the η was a distinct word probably meaning *sit*. Still clearer is the ignorance of F*, who carefully sets it off by a dot (.) as a distinct word, although at the end of a paragraph and untranslated in his Latin—a blank half-line follows the η , the next line begins on the extreme left. Even this is not all. The corrector F** did not recognize this ending. For he has inserted a ν above the η , intending to make $\eta\nu$ (or perhaps ν) instead of η , but he has not joined the η to $\theta\epsilon\iota$ by a link, \cup , as is always done on recognizing a false division. So then none of these monks were familiar with the ending in question, and it is thus made certain that F could not have scrupled over $\tau\eta\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota$ as unintelligible because of the omitted η .

But the question remains: How shall we explain this strange divergence between F and G? In answer we observe, what Zimmer has forgotten to state, that g has left $\tau\eta\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota$ untranslated. Hence we suspect there was a text in which it did not appear. Furthermore, its position, at the end of the sentence and after the phrase "of our Lord Jesus Christ," is awkward and surprising; such a phrase naturally and almost invariably closes its sentence or its clause. The two or three exceptions are themselves suspicious and in our opinion belong to a corrupt text. Moreover, that such a text really lies before us here is strongly hinted by the fact that the form $\tau\eta\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\eta$ is not textually unquestioned. D has THPHΘIHN, the N has been erased, perhaps by D**, and D*** has made it ΘΕΙΗ. Besides, Bas eth 229 codices give $\epsilon\nu\rho\epsilon\theta\eta$ and $\epsilon\nu\rho\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\eta$.² Lastly, we submit that the general structure as it now stands is unnatural and highly improbable. The change of subject from "God himself" with the active $\alpha\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$ to the triple "spirit and soul and body" with the passive $\tau\eta\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\eta$ is to our mind extremely arti-

² We do not raise the question: Could the Paul of 1 Cor., chap. 15, have thus written of "spirit, soul, and body"?

ficial and unlikely. So, too, the following, "Faithful he that calls you, who also will perform," sounds strange and puzzling. We venture to suggest that the passage is strongly interpolated, that an older form read something like this: *αυτος ο θεος της ειρηνης αγιασαι υμας (ολοτελεις), (ο) πιστος ο καλων υμας (ος και ποιησει)*. The omitted clause seems to have been inserted primarily as a marginal observation explaining *υμας ολοτελεις*, and without the *τηρηθειη*; then it crept into the text; then the nominative *ψυχη* seemed to require a verb, and *τηρηθειη* or *ευρεθειη* was added. Our F text seems to point back to a stage in this process when the verb had not yet established itself.

At any rate, it seems abundantly evident that the text at this point presented very early some uncertainty or fluctuation, and that F is here not derivable in any way from G. It seems unlikely even that F and G have here proceeded from a common origin; far more likely that F' and G' were diverse. We have devoted much space to this combination of Zimmer's, for it is one of the finest specimens of his ingenuity, but with the result that the structure falls in ruin and carries down with it the whole theory of its constructor. The other cases may be treated more briefly.

In Gal. 2:17 we find:

inveni sumus et ipsi peccatores
Ευρεθημεν και αυτοι τοις αμαρτωλοις κ. τ. λ.
μεν. και. αυτοι. τοις. αμαρτωλοις

mus et ipsi peccatores

Here, says Zimmer, in the delusion that he had written only *av*, G repeated *τοι* in the second line; and F copied thoughtlessly. To be sure, this is a possible explanation, but nothing more; it is not necessary, it is not even probable. For, plainly, the original(s) of both F G may have had the repeated *τοι*. It is just as likely that G' made the mistake as that G made it. Nay, it is far more likely; for we know that G* has copied with the utmost care. His attention must have been called to the repeated *τοι*, at least when he came to translate it. Moreover, he has revised his work with great pains, and wherever his eye has wandered and led him to omissions or repetitions, he has conscientiously inserted or deleted, be it words or phrases or letters. Since he has not deleted the *τοι*, the presumption is that it was in his original.

Zimmer's next appeal is to Gal. 6:10 and 1:6. Here we read:

<i>maxime</i>		<i>miror autem quod</i>
Μαχλιστα κ. τ. λ.	and	Μαζω δε οτι κ. τ. λ.;
<i>Maxime autem ad domesticos</i>		Μαχλιστα. δε. προσ. τουσ. οικιουσ
and		
<i>Miror quod sic tam cito trans</i>		Μαζω. δε. οτι. ταχαιωσ. μετα

Here the two codices present the same monsters, Μαχλιστα and Μαζω. Zimmer thinks them inexplicable in F, save as a thoughtless copy of G; but how, pray, are they to be explained in G? He assumes that the G scribe wrote Μαχλιστα "im Blick auf *Maxime*" which stands above it! Such is Matthäi's absurd suggestion, which Zimmer has adopted without hesitation or acknowledgement. But Matthäi himself assures us—which is every way unmistakable—that the Greek was written *first*, the Latin *afterward*. Such is plainly the case here, for Μαχλιστα is written close to the left edge, but *maxime* slightly to the right. So that the scribe could have been influenced by the *x* of *maxime* only in faith, which is the evidence of things not seen.

Similar remarks apply to the second case. Here again Matthäi suggests and Zimmer adopts the conceit that the *m* in *mirror* caught G's eye and betrayed him into writing Μαζω for θανμαζω! And this before *mirror* was itself written! Could anything be more preposterous? Not unless it be that in Gal. 4:6 υιοι is written instead of υιον, because, forsooth, *filii* was *going* to be written above it! But someone may of course ask: How did such errors originate? We answer: There are many things harder to understand; the spelling μαλλιστα prevails in both F and G, hence in their originals. We cannot know, but we may well suppose, it was written in F" and G" somewhat thus: ΜΑΛΛΙCΤΑ. If the upper curve of the λ was brought over a little too much, the appearance of the double letter λλ might easily be mistaken for χλ. Many stranger confusions are found in nearly every manuscript. As to Μαζω, the case is one of the omission of initials. Now, the omission of a single initial is very frequent in F and not unknown even in G. For instance, G has Τιμια (1 Cor. 11:14) for ατιμια. That the α had been omitted or at least confused in the original(s) of F and G is evident from F, which has [α] τιμια. The [α] is the insertion of a very recent hand. Hence F* left a space for the omitted α, which he *could not* have done if copying from G, where there is nothing to suggest it.

Of the explanation of such omissions we may not always be sure, but of the fact there is no doubt whatever. In the present case, as in many, there seems to be some connection with the shorthand of the originals. That abbreviations were frequent in the older MSS. is well known, and that they were present in the archetype of F is plain from the presence of the symbol κ for και in F. It is unlikely that F introduced this abridgment, and we shall produce yet other evidence of similar contractions.

Now, a tachygraphic symbol for $\alpha\nu$ is \sim , placed over the preceding consonant, so that $\theta\alpha\nu$ may be (and actually is) written thus $\tilde{\theta}$.³ The symbol might easily be omitted. Both in F and in G there are many examples of diacritical marks over letters, particularly ι and υ , and still more of their omission, where we can see no reason for diversity. They are often present in the one codex, but not in the other. In the grandparents (F" and G") of F and G these variations may very well have originated. We believe that F* and G*, in their greater ignorance, copied more faithfully if more mechanically. If the mark was omitted from θ , there would be left $\theta\mu\alpha\zeta\omega$. As unpronounceable, or written in the margin, or for some other reason, whether of accident or of design, θ may have been omitted before the μ , both by F' and by G', and the result would be the $\text{Ma}\zeta\omega$ as now seen. We do not put forth this explanation with great confidence; there are many ways in which things may happen. But we do maintain that the falling away of the $\theta\alpha\nu$ is hardly more difficult to understand than the falling away of so many other initials, as (in G) the τ from Τολμα , 1 Cor. 6: 1; that the explanations of similar cases are most probably similar; that the Matthäi-Zimmer conceit is merely amusing; and that the error of M for $\theta\alpha\nu\mu$ almost certainly marred the originals of F and G.

Just here we must remark that a fatal assumption seems to pervade the reasoning of Hort and Zimmer, namely, that the archetype of F and G was at least nearly correct as they account correctness, was about like B or \aleph . But this is purely gratuitous; it is indeed certainly false. There is no reason why this archetype may not have departed as far even from D as D from \aleph .

Lastly we may note that this form $\text{Ma}\zeta\omega$ is an eloquent testimonial to the ignorance in Greek of both F and G scribes. That they could accept this monster as the equivalent of *miror* shows plainly that they were copying letter by letter, slavishly, with only the feeblest comprehension of the Greek before them. That they should have undertaken to correct the sacred text which they could only so stumblingly read is extremely improbable. We must observe, however, that G has placed a marginal sign z opposite to the line containing Μαχλιστα . We do not know what this means, but it surely means something. It must refer to something in the line, and there is nothing in the line at all remarkable, nothing apparently to which it can refer, save only this prodigious χ . If this be the reference, then either G or G' observed this letter, but did not recognize it as an error of his own, and so did

³ LEHMANN, *Die Tachygraphischen Abkürzungen*, § 20, Taf. 3.

not correct it as he did his own errors ; if so, then the error could not have been such as Matthäi and Zimmer imagine, which would have been easy to observe and correct.

The next is a capital one, Gal. 5: 9, 10 :

	<i>modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit t fermentat autem</i>
	Μικρα ζυμη ολον το φυραμα ζυμοι. ^{ego} Εγω δε
h+	<i>quam habet confido in vobis in domino quod nihil aliud sen t sapietis</i>
	πεποιθα εισ υμας εν κω Οτι ουδεν αλλο φρο
	ην εχι <i>tietis d+ qui</i>
	veritas <i>νησεται: Ο δε κ. τ. λ.</i>
	ηαληθια
	<i>christi</i>
	του χυ
	Εγω. δε. πεποιθα. εισ. υμας. ενκω. <i>Ego autem confido in vobis in dno.</i>
	οτι. ουδεν. αλλο. φρονησεται. ην. <i>quod nihil aliud sapietis.+ quam</i>
	εχι. η. αληθια. του. χρυ. Ο. δε <i>habet veritas xpi. Qui autem.</i>

Now, says Zimmer, the marginal gloss (introduced by the sigla h÷ meaning *haec* [or *hoc*] *est*) refers to *massam*, since *quam* (ην) is the feminine relative ; F takes this up into the text, but misplaces it where it is *rein unverständlich*; hereby F betrays himself as copying unintelligently from G. Ingenious, very ! but nothing more. Here again Zimmer's whole argument is assumption tempered with error. He assumes that ην (*quam*) is a feminine relative and must refer to *massam*. This is wrong ; Tischendorf is plainly right in taking ην for the conjunction H (the letters H and N are hard to distinguish and continually confused) ; it means not *which* but *than*. It is only the reference to *massam* that is *rein unverständlich*; what does it mean, "the lump which the truth of Christ has" ? "A little leaven leavens the whole lump" is a proverb, and the relative clause tacked on makes nonsense. On the contrary, G has indicated with perfect clearness — which decisive fact is noted by Matthäi, but strangely forgotten by Zimmer — exactly where the marginal note belongs. This he has done by his sign d÷, which always means *deest*. On inserting this gloss immediately after φρονησεται we find this sentiment : "But I am persuaded touching you in the Lord that naught else will ye think than has the truth of Christ" — all your thought must be contained in the truth of Christ, must not go beyond it. The expression may be a trifle awkward, but it is perfectly intelligible. To our mind some such addition seems positively required by the context ; the word αλλο (*aliud*, "else")

demands an η (*quam*, "than") as its complement. But in any case such a complement is natural, even if not absolutely necessary; it is perfectly in place in F, and G has indicated unequivocally where he meant it to be inserted; even without this indication the gloss is too far down on the page to refer to *massam*.

We do not raise the question as to the oldest text, whether it did or did not contain such a clause. Granted it did not, the phenomena of the two texts by no means imply that F was taken from G. Nay, it is highly unlikely that F would have taken up such a marginal gloss from G into his text; for marginal glosses abound in G, yet nowhere else have they in the least affected F. On the face of it, F appears to be taken from another prototype than G, an appearance to which color is lent by a variety of circumstances.

At this point the really serious argumentation of Zimmer seems to cease. It is hard to believe that he himself can attach much weight to the considerations he lets follow. At most, the facts he adduces might be said to harmonize with his view, if that view were already made probable, but they themselves add scarcely anything to its probability. Here, for instance is the full text of his next *Erweis*:

ad esse

2 Kor. 5, 8 schreibt G *εν δημησαι*, davon nimmt F in einer seiner sofort zu besprechenden lateinischen Zwischenschriften nur das *ad* über *εν*- auf; *au* hat: (presentes) esse.

Four other quite similar examples are added. But what manner of syllogism is this? What is the mood? What the figure? It seems precisely as if one should try to *prove* that Rome is partly on the left bank of the Arno by *asserting* that it is partly on the *right*. How can Zimmer *know* that F took the *ad* from the Latin interlinear *g*? Latin versions numbered hundreds, if not thousands; says Jerome, *Tot exemplaria, quot codices*; there were probably scores from which F might have taken *ad* or any other of the interlineations, *if he had taken them at all*. But even this is not correct; these interlineations in F are not by the F scribe, the copyist of the Greek; they are by his reviser F**, they are *secunda manu*, according to the unimpeachable testimony of Scrivener.⁴

⁴ The only clear case of a first-hand interlineation, according to Scrivener, is in Rom. 12:20, where *pota illum* is written over $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\iota\zeta\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$. In the opposite
potum da illi t pota illum
 Latin (f) stands *potum da illi*; G has both: $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\iota\zeta\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$. Whence it would seem that both renderings were familiar, and there is no apparent reason for supposing that F took the second from G. The translation is so obvious that more than one version must have hit on it. Also the [*uualtit*?] over $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\nu\sigma\iota\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota$, 1 Cor. 7:4, seems to be *prima manu*.

At this breath the cardboard castles of Zimmer tumble in a heap. It *may* be that this second hand, F**, turned over the pages of G or some other codex and compared them with F, and drew thence some of his interlineations. We see no compelling reason for this supposition, but it matters not whether it be true or false; we are not now concerned with the Latin interlineations of F**, but solely with the Greek text of F*.

That these interlineations cannot all be taken from G is admitted by Zimmer himself in a footnote: "Indessen stammen nicht alle diese Beischriften aus G." Since, then, it is certain that many (at least nearly one-fifth) came from some other unknown source, it seems probable that all came from that source; for it is less likely that the annotator F** used two sources than only one.

We come now to the Itacisms. It would seem impossible, even in the extremest case, to deduce from agreement in itacism any argument in favor of Zimmer's hypothesis. Even if F and G agreed in every instance of the misplacement of like-sounding vowels and diphthongs, would it prove or render probable that either was a copy of the other? By no means; for both might just as well be copies of a common original. But what are the facts? The twain do *not nearly* agree in these misspellings; in nearly a thousand (968) instances they disagree; that is, about four times to the page. This is certainly a very *large* fact; how shall we explain it? Zimmer makes no attempt at all. But a difference in itacism calls for explanation quite as loudly as any other. True, if F* had been copying, not by eye, but by ear, if someone had been reading off the Greek to him, then such errors would have been natural enough. Only, they would have been altogether too natural. Grossly ignorant as he was of Greek, he could not have taken down from such dictation a single line without multiplied blunders. This hypothesis, that F* copied from sound and not from sight, is not made by Zimmer and is contradicted on every page in countless ways. Still it deserves some little consideration. Very many misspellings both in F and in G seem to be indubitably errors of the ear and not of the eye; as, for instance, the frequent confusion of *ι* and *υ*, of *δ* and *θ*, of *ο* and *ω*. But such mistakes were not made by either F or G scribe; they were made centuries before, by copyists who knew immensely more Greek and who trusted their ears and their own notions of orthography, and often with disastrous results.

Let us consider one example carefully. Of larger words the copyist must have been at least as familiar with *αμαρτια* as with any other; in

Romans it recurs constantly. We should naturally expect his spelling to be uniform, unless controlled by a copy before him. Now on p. 14 of F it is three times spelled *αμαρτια*, three times *αμαρτεια*, and each time agrees with G. On p. 15 it is spelled twice with *ε*, four times without *ε*, always agreeing with G. But in three of these cases it is written most strangely *αμαρτ. ια*, and in all four an *ε* has been written above the *ι*. It is not easy to see what can be the explanation, but it is plain that the interlineator is *not* following G, which does not offer the *ε*. Furthermore, the queer form *αμαρτ. ια* points to some contraction or other obscurity in some ancestor of F. Surely *something* must have misled him to this strange mutilation, and there is nothing in G to mislead any one.

Again, in Rom. 6:17 F has *αμαρτιασ*, but G *αμαρτειασ*; in 7:23 both F and G have *αμαρτιασ*, but F** has inserted *ε* above *ι*—why? In 6:20 F has *αμαρτειασ*, but G has *αμαρτειασ*. Similar oscillations may be traced out in scores of words. Do they *prove* anything? Possibly not; but they certainly do not suggest that the F scribe had G before him. Looking still more closely we find that of these 968 vowel-differences a great number are interchanges of *ο* and *ω*. These are easy to understand as lapses of the ear, but not of the eye, since the two letters are not at all alike, especially in G. Nearly as frequent is the interchange of *ε* and *η*. Here there is no resemblance at all in G, where the letters are made thus: *ε*, H, very distinctly and uniformly. Where F has a vowel, *ε* or *ι*, and G the diphthong *ει*, one is of course tempted to say that F has carelessly dropped a letter; but how when the case is reversed? Did he carelessly insert a letter? Did he carelessly put *αι* for *ε* and *vice versa*? We cannot believe it. Some of these errors have been corrected by F**, but not in general to accord with G; so that we fail to find good reason for thinking the reviser must have used the Boernerianus. To us it seems that both F* and G* have copied mechanically, but faithfully, and that they have merely presented the irregular spelling of former centuries, which has crept in some measure into every known manuscript. It seems utterly impossible that F* should have made nearly a thousand mistakes in vowels, unless he copied *very* carelessly; but in that case he must have made a thousand mistakes in his consonants, which are as numerous and as alike in appearance. But this he has by no means done. There are only 166 interchanges of consonants. And why are these exchanges almost confined to cases of easy mispronunciation? H is as much like *ο* as like *ε*, yet it is never miswritten for the former, very often for the latter. The

same remarks apply to consonants. Θ resembles Λ no more than Φ , yet it is frequently confounded with the one, never with the other. Once more, ω (in G) is not the least like \circ , but very like μ and $\lambda\lambda$; yet (in F) it is continually confounded with that, but with these never.

View the matter as you will, then, the great mass of variations between F and G seem to be mistakes of sound and not of sight. But it is everywhere assumed, and nowhere disputed, that these copies (or in any case F) were made from sight and not from sound. It follows that such mistakes in these venerable manuscripts are far more venerable still; they point back centuries to a time when Greek was still familiar to the western half of the empire, and the 968 itacisms with the many other letter confusions of this class indicate that the originals F' and G', though very closely related, were yet distinct.

On the other hand, a very respectable number of such letter-confusions seem to point directly to manuscripts themselves as seen and not heard. Such, for example, is the substitution of Λ for Δ in the oblique cases of *avnp*. Of this there are five cases on page 1 of folio 13, Rom. 7:1-3: *vnpavpoσ*, *avapoσ*, *avapoσ*, *avapι*, *avapι*. None of these errors are in G. Similar blunders occur elsewhere in F, but only sporadically. Here it is plainly the eye that has been deceived. In fact, Λ and Δ are very easy to confound, either by lowering the horizontal bar in Λ or by raising it in Δ . The initial Λ in G is often hard to distinguish from Δ , but not so the medial α and δ . These in G are uniformly made thus: α and λ and can scarcely be mistaken when they catch the eye, even apart from their connection. While then we cannot affirm it was impossible for F* to copy the *avdp* of G into *avap*, we do affirm five such blunders in three verses to be extremely improbable; especially, as the Latin *vir* was in every instance written distinctly above the Greek word in G. If then he knew anything about what he was taking down, he could hardly have blundered so repeatedly. But if he was picking out his letters one by one from a manuscript written in uncials continuously, with no Latin translation above, the mistaking of Δ for Λ would seem incomparably easier.

From these generalities there may be little to deduce with certainty. This, however, we may say with absolute confidence, and Zimmer himself would hardly dispute it, that there is in all these phenomena nothing to prove or even to render probable the derivation of F from G. Possibly, but only possibly, these facts may all be interpreted in harmony with such derivation, but they are far more readily comprehended otherwise. It is difficult to distinguish always with perfect clearness

between what Zimmer intends as proof, and what as confirmation, and what he is merely seeking to construe as not necessarily discrepant with his theory. He has the unfortunate habit of stating boldly as a *fact* what is at best only one possible interpretation of a fact, as in the passage quoted (p. 460). But if we understand him after repeated readings, and this is the most generous construction, the last nine pages of his memoir attempt no real proof of his thesis; but would merely show that all the phenomena there treated (of itacism and the like) do not necessarily gainsay his contention. With this in the main we need have no quarrel; the issue is too vague to admit of sharp contest; but we close this part of the discussion by recalling the result already reached, that thus far all of Zimmer's ostensible proofs fail outright, and rather oppose than support his contentions.

However, in a very sharp review of Corsen, he has come again to the front with added "proofs" that demand notice. Of these the first is a *pièce de résistance*, decidedly the weightiest he has yet produced. *Voici*. In Rom. 8:35 we read in G and F respectively:

<i>ratio an angustia</i>	<i>persecutio</i>
εισ Η στενσῶρια.	Δωγμος. κ. τ. λ.
<i>† σχωρια</i>	
η. στεν [†] χωρια. δι. ωγμοσ	<i>an angustia an persecutio</i>

Now, says Zimmer, the original of F must have appeared "photographically exactly" like G. For he explains the whole situation thus: (1) G found (or read) σ in his original, instead of the ο in στενοχωρια (2) he was doubtful whether an α or a χ followed it; (3) he preferred α, but wrote τχ over it, alas! not exactly over it; (4) the F scribe was uncertain whether the τχ referred to α or to the preceding σ as alternative; (5) therefore he wrote in his text στεν[†]χωρια and in the margin † σχωρια, thus leaving choice between στενχωρια and στενοσχωρια. He holds that F is inexplicable save as presupposing G exactly; for "it is decisive for the F text that τχ was placed rather over σ than over α."

Such is by far the most plausible of Zimmer's constructions, and at first blush it may well perplex if not convince us. However, on recovering from our admiration and surprise, we observe instantly that No. 5 in this sorites is a mistake; F* did not write the interlineation † and the gloss † σχωρια; they are *secunda manu*. Such is the judgment of Scrivener, from which there is no appeal. With this observation the exact photograph becomes a blur. What F* wrote was simply στενχωρια, whereas G* wrote στεν[†]σῶρια. The question then is: Does this text of F presuppose the G text exactly? Manifestly, no! It is not even *cer-*

tain that the $\epsilon\chi$ is *prima manu*; but granted that it is, it would have been unnatural for F* to have put the alternative χ instead of the σ of the text proper. This is not all, however. Zimmer holds that the $\epsilon\chi$ refers to α , but was slightly miswritten, so as to refer more naturally to σ . But how does he know this? We affirm that it is more probably correctly written and refers to the σ . Such alternatives in G point naturally and properly backward, not forward. Once more, Zimmer holds that G has also mistaken an \omicron for a σ , but how can he be sure thereof? We think it quite as likely G has done nothing of the kind. But if Zimmer's explanation is held to be unnecessary, what other is there to propose?

Well, since it comes to guessing, perhaps we, too, may hazard a guess. It shall be a very modest one, accepting the facts at their face value and striving to interpret them as they are. These facts are that G has $\epsilon\chi$ where F has $\chi\alpha$. We refer the alternative χ to σ , as alone is natural and almost certainly correct. Is there a letter that may be thus doubtfully or doubly read? Certainly, it is χ itself which is often written \mathfrak{C} , as in \mathfrak{N} and in G itself. If the left side be dim the letter may easily be taken for C. This then seems to be a very natural and nearly lying explanation: The original of F and G was CTEN \mathfrak{C} AWPIA, and the left line of the \mathfrak{C} was obscure. Such facts are continually presenting themselves in ancient manuscripts. But is not this word corrupt? Certainly, it should be CTEN \mathfrak{O} AWPIA. But we have no right to assume that the F and G original was correct at this point, since it is known to have been incorrect at so many others. Precisely how the error in this original itself originated we cannot know; enough that *such* errors abound. Perhaps there was a mere transposition of letters—such as in $\alpha\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ for $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ (G, 1 Cor. 14:5), or in $\chi\sigma\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ for $\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ (Phil. 2:8)—and a confusion of \omicron and α ; perhaps it was primarily an error of the ear rather than of the eye; $\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omicron\chi\omega\rho\iota\alpha$ and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\chi\alpha\omega\rho\iota\alpha$ are not too unlike in sound to be confounded. Zimmer's hypothesis that the \mathfrak{O} was taken for the C is plausible in itself, but his reference of the $\epsilon\chi$ to α is unjustified by G's usage, and the confusion of α and χ , while possible, is not so likely. At the very best, his whole construction is merely a possible explanation; it is certainly not natural, still less necessary. As an argument, then, it is weightless.

The fact that G* has indicated an alternative $\epsilon\chi$ shows clearly that he has not proceeded hastily, but cautiously, and hence that it was impossible for him to decide between σ (or, as Zimmer will have it, α) and χ . Hence we must conclude, not only that he knew exceeding

little Greek, but that there was some deep obscurity in his original. That this latter was imperfect at this point is made probable by the absence of H before Διωγμος, though essential to the sense. We need not marvel then if the rare word στενοχωρια was miswritten in G's original.

With the interlineation in F we have little concern. It may have been suggested by a later comparison of F with G, or it may not. It is enough for us that it forms no part of F proper.

It is a characteristic defect, fatal to Hort's and Zimmer's reasoning, that they neglect the possibility—nay, the probability—that the errors met with in F and G are old errors faithfully copied from ancient sources. More than this, Zimmer often fails to look beyond the word immediately under consideration. Had he glanced forward to the next vocable, he would have perceived that his explanation, so far from being necessary, was not even probable. For it is very hard to believe that, with the G text Διωγμος^{persecutio} before him, the F scribe could ever have written Δι.ωγμος. The Greek in G is written plainly as one word, and the Latin translation stamps it unmistakably as one word; why then should, how then could, F split it into two and carefully separate them by a period? The only answer we can think of is that he recognized δι as the equivalent of *per* written above it, and so wrote it as for δια. But such an etymological observation, if he really made it, must have guided him aright instead of astray. For since *per* is not a distinct word, but only a part of *persecutio*, why should he think δι as distinct and not a part of Διωγμος as written? It seems very hard to doubt that the scribe was picking out the letters from a manuscript *continuo scripta*, that he thought he recognized δι, and accordingly wrote it down as a word before he came to the rest.

If the foregoing example excites our admiration of Zimmer's ingenuity, the following must move our wonder at something else. In Rom. 6:9 we have in G and F:

illius non ultra dominabitur quod enim mortuus est
αυτου. ουκ ετει κυριευει. ο γαρ απεθανεν

† *datius peccato*
τη. αμαρτια. κ.τ.λ.

θανατος αυτου ουκ ετει κυ *mors illi non domi*
ριευει Ο γαρ απεθανεν. τη *nabitur. Quod enim mortuum est*

The sign † means *est*, and the reference in G is of course to τη. Now, says Zimmer, F misreferred this *datius* to αυτου above instead of to τη below, and hence wrote *illius* instead of *illius*. But how can Zimmer even

suspect, not to say know, that F did any such thing, so unnatural and unparalleled? We must bear in mind that F* had already written *illi* and its whole line *before* he came to the *·* *dativus* and its line; can we believe he would look below before writing a line that could give no ground for hesitance? Even in this aspect Zimmer's explanation (!) seems highly unlikely; moreover, it is wholly unnecessary. For why be surprised at the dative *illi*? *Dominor* is used with all the oblique cases, ablative, accusative, dative, genitive. It is with the latter that its use is especially late. Lastly, the greatest Vulgate manuscript, the Codex Amiatinus, has it precisely as F, *mors illi ultra non dominabitur*.⁵ Now F's Latin (F) is in general Vulgate; why then wonder because it is Vulgate here? We have never seen a more venturesome explanation where there was absolutely nothing to be explained. In itself the matter is not worthy of mention even, but we have dwelt on it, because it is invaluable as illustrating vividly the method and the animus of Zimmer, who is dead set on making out a case against F at any cost; with reason, if he can; without reason, if he must.

The rest of this column in Zimmer's review is scarcely better. Thus in Rom. 5: 17, the readings are

si enim in uno delicto
 Ει γαρ εν ενει παραπτωμα

mors
 τι. ό. θανατος κ.τ.λ.

delicto mors regna

παραπτωμα ο θανατος βασιλευ

Zimmer seems to think the omission of *τι* by F is due to its position at the beginning of a line in G! But why so? Such divisions of words occur by the hundreds in both manuscripts. Besides, the *τι* is more conspicuous at the beginning of a line than elsewhere, and hence not more, but less, likely to be passed over. The fact in question is not so much an argument for as against the derivation of F from G.

Again, in 2 Cor. 12: 7 G has at the close of a line *αποκαλυψ*, and F *αποκλυψ* *δω. κ.τ.λ.* But is F following G? Why so? The source of G had the word incomplete; at least it may have had it so, so far as we know; why then may not F have taken it from that or a kindred source? Nay, more; the form in F strongly testifies that it is *not* taken from G; for F leaves a blank space after *ψ*, but there is no such space left in G. The natural supposition is that there *was* a blank in F's original, which then could not have been G. The only way to escape this conclusion is to suppose that F* recognized *αποκλυψ* (not *αποκαλυψ*, as given by Zimmer) as an incomplete word. But his Greek knowledge was very improbably

⁵ Exactly so also the very ancient Codex Fuldensis: *mors illi ultra non dominabitur*.

equal to such a feat. According to Zimmer he was puzzled by the word, perceived its incompleteness, and left a space. If so, he must have observed it carefully. Why then did he omit the α? Why did he put the bar indicating contraction? Why did he leave a space after the contraction, as he has done nowhere else? These phenomena are hard to explain on Zimmer's hypothesis; whether or not it is possible to explain them, it is certain that they do not favor derivation from G. It seems every way more likely that F has reproduced his original F', exactly. The remoter original, F'', most probably had $\overline{\text{ATTOKAAYY}}$, abbreviated at the end of a line. The omission of A followed perhaps from its confusion with Λ.

Still forgetting that the interlineations in F are from F** and not from F*, Zimmer repeats that they are, in part, intelligible only as taken from G. But what of it, even if true? It would only show that F**, not that F*, had seen G. But it is not true. The interlineations and alterations in G are not original with G*. Many of them far transcend his Greek culture; they were derived from translations then existent; they are most probably in most cases mere copies. And if G got them from some written source, why may not F have gotten them from the same source? But let us examine some specimens of these *Beischriften*. First Cor. 5:11 reads

ebriosus aut rapax cum huiusmodi nont nec comedere
 μεθυσσοσ Η. αρπαξ. τω. τουιουτω μητε συνεσθει

cum
 ροσ. η. μεθυσσοσ. η. αρπαξ. τω *dicus. aut ebriosus. aut rapax.*
 τοιουτω; μητε. συνεσθειεν *cum huiusmodi nec cibum sumere*

Zimmer thinks this *cum* inexplicable except as taken from G! But we think it may be explained most easily. The Latin lines have been measured off word for word as closely as possible, and almost syllable for syllable, to correspond with the opposite Greek. So *dicus* represents ροσ and, just above, *tus* balances τησ, and *tur* balances μενοσ. Here, however, there was a slight displacement. The *huiusmodi*, and not the *cum*, corresponds to τοιουτω; strictly, there is nothing for *cum* to match. This was doubtless known to F' (or F'') who first divided into lines thus, whom F* has faithfully copied; but it puzzled F**, who thought that *cum* rendered τω and so should have been placed immediately after *rapax*; for the benefit of posterity he notes this precious discovery by writing *cum* over τω! The G scribe was quite as ignorant; he too thought that τω meant *cum*; so perhaps did many; we need not suppose one copied from the other.

The important point in this passage Zimmer misses altogether; it is the semicolon (;) after *τοιουντω*. G has a period (.) ; why did F put the meaningless ; unless he was copying closely? The period in G is unmistakable, and if F was copying G, he was copying closely, for he has omitted the *υ* which G had expunged by dots; whence then the semicolon?

Once more, in 1 Cor. 11:2 we read:

sicut ubique tradidi
Καθως πανταχου παραδωκα. κ.τ.λ.
ω ubique
και. καθως. παντα. χου. παρα et sicut tradidi vobis

Zimmer thinks the *ubique* in F taken from G, but why so? It is not F*, but F**, that is comparing Greek and Latin conscientiously, but ignorantly. He finds nothing translating *παντα*; some other version supplies him *ubique*, which he writes over *παντα*; the *χου* is left untranslated! But that F is not here copied from G is triply plain; because of the *ο* instead of *ω*, which letters are not at all alike in G; because of the false division *παντα. χου*; and because of the dot above the *ι*—neither of which last is in G.

En passant we observe that had Zimmer glanced at the top of this same page in G (9 lines above in F), he might have detected something far more ominous than his *ubique*. For, 1 Cor. 10:32, there stands

iudaeis
ιουδαιοιςτε
et graecis et
Και ελλησειν και. τη. κ.τ.λ.
οις. τεκαι. ελλησειν. κ, τη. εκ is et gentibus et eccle

How can this be derived from that? Could F* fail to see that *τε* in G was a part of the word *ιουδαιοιςτε*? that *Και*, the all-familiar *και*, was itself a word, was the beginning of a line, was capitalized? Why should he cut off the *τε* and prefix it to *και*? Why abbreviate the second *και*? Why leave a blank after *gentibus*? These questions are not captious, but just and natural. To none of them does G offer any answer. Shall we believe that the ignorant monk was following his original faithfully, or that he was departing from G wilfully and wantonly?

To return to Zimmer's examples, in 1 Tim. 5:19 we read:

adversus presbyterum accusationem noli recipere
Κατα πρεσβυτερον Καταγοριαν Μη παραδε
excepto exceptist nisi duobus aut tribus testibus
χου. Εκτος ειμη δυο η. τριων Μαρτυρων

<i>Adversus presbiterum accusati</i>	Κατα. πρεσβυτερου. κατηγο
<i>onem noli recipere. Nisi</i>	^{exceptis} ριαν. μη. παραδεχον. εκτος
	nisi ω
<i>sub duobus aut tribus testi</i>	ειμη. δυο. η. τριον. μαρτυ

Zimmer thinks F must have taken the Latin interlineations from G. But why? Precisely as before, it is F**, not F*, who finds that, contrary to rule, the *nisi* at the end must refer to *ειμη* at the beginning, and he merely makes a note of it. Then *εκτος* remained untranslated. From some source he discovers that it means *exceptis*, and this also he jots down. *Voilà tout*. But here again it is triply evident that G is not the prototype of F; for why should F divide G's closely-written *παραδε* into *παρα δε*? And how could he mistake the large *ω* of G for an *ο*? These errors have been corrected, but why were they made? is the question. Lastly, why should F split the word *μαρτυρων* if copying from G? There is ample room in the short line of eighteen letters for the *ρων*, and how could he fail to write it out so, if the final *μαρτυρων* of G lay full before him? What possible motive does G present for carrying forward the *ρων* to the next line? None whatever; on the contrary.

The rule that Zimmer's witnesses on cross-examination turn coat and testify against him is strikingly exemplified in the following, 1 Cor. 14:4:

	<i>qui loquitur</i>
	Ο. λαλει <i>t</i> λαλων
<i>lingua seipsum aedificet</i>	<i>qui vero prophetat ecclesiam</i>
γλωσση εαντον οικοδομι	Ο δε προφητευων εκκλησιαν
παραμύθειαν. Ο. λαλει. γλωσση.	<i>consolationem. Qui loquitur lingua</i>
εαντον. οικοδομι. Οδε προφη	<i>semetipsum aedificat. Qui autem prophete</i>

Here, thinks our critic, the G scribe, "knowing extremely little Greek," transformed his Greek text *ολαλων* into *ολαλει*, to correspond with his Latin *qui loquitur*! But, not being quite sure of his transformation, he inserted the proper text *λαλων* with a *t* (for *aut*) before it! The miserable F*, knowing still less Greek, had (?) to take his choice, and of course chose the wrong one. It is hard to believe one's own eyes in reading this argument (!), or to repress the exclamation: "Zimmer, Zimmer, thou art beside thyself! Much learning hath made thee mad!" The whole context in Corinthians is literally made up of such participial constructions, *δ* with some word ending in *ων*, invariably rendered by *qui* with a finite verb; two verses above we have *ο γαρ λαλων*, ^{*qui enim loquitur*} and again one verse below *ο λαλων*. ^{*qui loquitur*} All of these participles G has faithfully and unscrupulously retained, but now we are asked to believe

he suddenly changes his mind and tampers with his text, changing *λαλων* into *λαλει*! This too is the G that knows so extremely little about Greek. He would seem to know still less about his duty and common sense. And then, his courage failing him at the last moment, he inserts his timid *τ λαλων*! We submit that this whole construction is a slander on a faithful transcriber. If we turn it the other way, it becomes far less incredible. If the text before G read ^{qui loquitur} ο λαλει, he might have paused, even though knowing little Greek, for he had just written ^{qui enim loquitur} ο γαρ λαλων, and have been tempted to insert his *τ λαλων*. We do not think even this very likely, but more likely that this text contained the *λαλων* as a correction, interlinear or marginal. The archetype before F had simply *ολαλει*, or, if there was any alternative, F did not see fit to preserve it.⁶ It seems to us he would certainly have copied G as he found it. That he did not have it before him is further indicated in the omission of ο (*οικοδομι*), in the false division *προ φη*, and in the false union *Οδε*. In the second line below there is evidence still clearer; for G has wrongly ^{loqui} αλλειν, while F has rightly *λαλειν*. We cannot believe that our F*, *im Griechisch noch unwissender*, would thus have changed the text before him.

Highly important is the example that follows, Phil. 3 : 7 :

<i>ge est factus t conservatus sine querela</i>	<i>quae quaedam fuerunt t erant mihi</i>
μω. γενομενος. αμεμπτος.	Α τινα ην μοι
<i>conservatus sine querela. Sed</i>	<i>γενομενος. αμεμπτος. αλλι. τι</i>
<i>quae mihi fuerunt lucra haec arbi</i>	<i>να. ην. μοι. Κερδη. ταυτα. ηγη</i>

Now, says Zimmer, F did not understand the α standing alone, but deduced from his Latin that it must correspond to *sed* (in spite of the translation above it!); hence he conjectured αλλι (meaning of course αλλα) (!), hence his text given above. At this point it seems impossible not to admire the courage of our critic, whatever we may think of his judgment; how boldly he would pluck the fig of safety from the thistle of danger! A passage that plainly contradicts his theory he would dare to wrest into support of that theory. But is he successful? We shall soon see.

Zimmer tells us with perfect confidence just what F did and thought; but how does he know all this? The tacit assumption is that there is no other explanation of the phenomena. Can this be true? Far from it. From reading Zimmer one would hardly suppose that the F text

⁶ We suspect that *λαλει* originated in a misunderstanding of a contracted form, as *λαλ̄*, at the end of a line.

is much more strongly attested than that of G. Yet, such is the case. For omitting $\alpha\lambda\alpha$, stand \aleph AG, 17 dg, Euthal, Cyr, Lcif, Amb, Victorin; for retaining $\alpha\lambda\alpha$, BD* (and as $\alpha\lambda\lambda$) \aleph^c D^c FKL, *al pler.*, Did., Bas., Chrysost., Thdrt., Dam., fvg go syr^{tr} cp arm, Aug; so, too, the great editors Westcott and Hort, Weiss, Baljon, Lipsius, Nestle; Tischendorf naturally goes with \aleph . In fact, it is plain that $\alpha\lambda\alpha$ is positively required by the sense, whatever the authorities might say. The thing to explain, then, would seem to be not why F has $\alpha\lambda\lambda(\iota)$, but why G does not have it? Yet Zimmer insists that F, faithless to G, has adapted his Greek to his Latin, has translated *sed* back into $\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota$ which he then substituted for α ! This is an utterly empty conceit of Zimmer's, who should have remembered his own important words: *Auch durch seinen lateinischen Text lässt der Schreiber sich in der Herstellung des Griechischen nicht beeinflussen*. We hold it highly unlikely that so ignorant a copyist would have tried his hand at improving the Greek before him, by translating his Latin into Greek, especially when his Greek was written down before his Latin. Neither would he have translated *sed* by $\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota$, for which he could find no precedent. It avails not to say he *meant* $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ —a mere assertion.

How, then, shall we explain this $\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota$? We answer that in the archetype of F, as in most codices, the second α was probably omitted, and also perhaps the first α of *ariva*, the omission being probably indicated by a comma or the like, so that the text may have stood thus: $\alpha\lambda\lambda$, *tiva*. Such commas occur both in F and still oftener in G. This comma might easily have been mistaken for an ι , whether by F or by F'. Of course, we cannot be sure in such a matter, but the ι need give us no great concern; the miswriting of a single letter is frequent enough.

Herewith is not meant that we regard the now accepted text, with $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, as primitive; for while we may readily understand the insertion of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ (to smooth the construction), we cannot understand its omission. On the other hand, neither can we comprehend how the writer of Philippians could have left it out in the first place. Still again, no more can we comprehend how he could use a second $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ in vs. 8, since the opposition is already expressed by the first. What then is the solution? We answer that the whole vs. 7 is an interpolation. Originally a marginal note, *summarizing what follows* (vss. 8–11), it was written without $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$. Then it was taken up into the text, beginning *ariva* . . . ; then the harshness was keenly felt, and the $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ was inserted to soften it. But this first $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ then jarred on the second already present in vs. 8, and

hence the wavering between the two forms, neither of which was felt as quite satisfactory. Similar cases abound in the New Testament, "thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks in Vallombrosa."

We are now come to the last of Zimmer's proof-texts, 1 Cor. 9:20:

		<i>et factus sum t fui</i>	
		Και εγενομην τοις	
<i>quasi iudaeis iudaeis</i>	<i>ut</i>		
ωσ ιουδαιοις ιουδαιοις	ἵνα κ.τ.λ.		
<i>rem. et factus sum judae</i>		δησω. κ, εγενομην. τοις. ιουδ.	
		a.	
<i>is tam quam judaeus. ut judaeos</i>		δαισ. ιουδαιοις. Ἰν	ιουδαιουσ

Here, says our text-critic, the G scribe repeated by dittography the *ιουδαιοις*, *iudaeis* (Zimmer means *ιουδαιοις*, and should have written it so), instead of proceeding with *ωσ ιουδαιος*, *quasi iudaeus* (*ωσ ιουδαιος*); then he observed his mistake and sought to correct it by putting *ωσ* in the margin and deleting an ι in *ιουδαιοις*; but alas! he deleted it in the first instead of the second of the dittographs, and F copied down blindly, of course! It will be observed that F is highly complaisant; he can be careless and ignorant of Greek, or sharp-sighted and a stickler for syntax and orthography—anything to please Herr Zimmer.

This is certainly one of the sturdiest "seeming pillars" that our critic has raised. Let us look at it closely. Like the rest, it is built up of a series of assumptions. How can we be sure of the least of them? That G should repeat *ιουδαιοις* seems improbable, but not impossible; that he should repeat both *ιουδαιοις* and *iudaeis* before noticing his dittography is still less likely, though possible still. On perceiving it, the natural thing would have been to delete the repetition by dots, as he generally does, and then continue with *ωσ*; yet he might have done as Zimmer conjectures. That he should mistake the word to be corrected is, of course, possible, but nothing more; for he is evidently thoughtful at this stage of his work. The unlikelihood seems to increase on observing that he has apparently at least started to correct the first *iudaeis* into *iudaeus* (*prius iudaeis ita scriptum et, ut videtur, ita correctum est, ut dubius sit lector inter iudaeis et iudaeus*—Matthäi).

Strangest of all it is that F should not have noticed the *ωσ* ^{quasi} which is plain to see, nor yet the solecism in *τοις ιουδαιοις*, nor have corrected it according to his Latin text—F who is so prone, according to Zimmer, to do just such things at the wrong time. Now, we ask, are all of these violent hypotheses really necessary to explain the facts? They

must be, if we are to accept Zimmer's view. But we think the case far more easily comprehended thus: F has copied correctly. His original was incorrect. The confusion of the two cases was easy enough; greater confusions meet us at every turn. The marginal note in G was most probably present in G's archetype; it seems highly unlikely that G would put any of his text proper in the margin, and also unlikely, though not so unlikely, that he could invent such an explanatory gloss. The misplaced ι which he deletes is only one of many such corrected errors. If F' was the same as G', then the F scribe simply omitted the marginal gloss (if it was present). Certainly, all this was possible, and to us it seems far more probable than Zimmer's explanation.

This is not all, however, for the passages transcribed contain positive evidence that the one was not copied from the other. Why is the Και of G turned into κ? Why is the υ inserted in the second ιουδαιοις? Why are the four υ's dotted and not as in G? Why is the α omitted in ^{a.}Ιν? Clearly not from carelessness, for a space is left blank. These are four phenomena that singly and collectively militate against derivation from G. Looking back only two verses, to verse 18, we find still further evidence. Here we read:

	<i>potestate</i>	<i>mea</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>euangelio</i>	<i>nam cum liber</i>
θαι.	την.	ἐξουσειαν.	μου	εν.	τω. ευαγγελιω.
				Ελευ	
<i>potestate</i>	<i>mea</i>	<i>ineuange</i>	<i>ἐξουσειαν.</i>	<i>μοι.</i>	<i>Εν. το. ευαγγε</i>

Has F taken this from G? How then shall we explain the dotting of the υ's, which is not usual, though frequent in F? How explain the μοι for μου, when *mea* was in both f and g for guidance? How explain the ο for ω, when the two are so unlike in G? Why did F not take offense at such a solecism as εν το, especially with G's τω before him and his own ευαγγελιω? Why did he capitalize the ε in Εν? and the immediately following υ in Υπο? Why does he decapitalize the μ in Μη and the υ in ΙΝα? These questions may not be unanswerable, but we know of no plausible answer. We cannot believe that this *noch unwissender* monk is playing thus fast and loose with the G text before him, now corrupting, now purifying, alternately displaying the grossest carelessness and the very refinement of care. We hold that he is throughout one and the same, reproducing his original with much fidelity, though with little intelligence. Let him be as careless or as careful as you will, but not both at the same time.

We have now examined all of Zimmer's proof-texts minutely, and with this result: that they fail, one and all, to warrant his conclusions.

Not one of his interpretations is necessary, not one is even probable, though several are very ingenious; the most, the best, that can be said of any is that it is possible. Even then, on the evidence he himself adduces, the decision must go against him.

II.

But has all the relevant testimony been produced? One might suppose so, for our critic assures us in wide-spaced print and repeatedly that he has examined every single passage and knows that there is nothing counter to be brought forward; and it would surely be very unscientific in him not to hear the other side, to parade all that makes for, and withhold all that makes against, his thesis.

Be this as it may, we too have examined every single passage. We have compared F and G in every detail, noting every difference in word-division or coalescence, every end of a line, every difference in letter or in spacing; and all of these we have marked in F in red ink,⁷ thus practically superimposing the one text upon the other. The total impression produced by this immediate comparison is that the resemblance between the two, while often very striking, has yet been greatly exaggerated; the diversities are still more striking and dispel from our mind every shadow of doubt that F is *not* a copy of G. Nay, we hold it unlikely even that both are derived immediately from a common parent; they seem to be more probably second cousins than brothers.

Well, then, to the testimony. In Tit. 1:6 we read:

sicut ego tibi disposui si quis
 ρουσ. Ως εγω σοι διαταξαμην. Ει τις
est sine crimine unius uxoris vir
 εστιν ανεγκλητος Μιας γυναικος ανηρ
 ρουσ. ως. εγω. σοι. διαταξαμην *vos sicut ego tibi disposui*

^η
 Επισ. εστιν. ανεκκλητος. Μιας. *Siquis sine crimine est unius*

We hold that no genius of perversity could derive the latter from the former. It appears simply impossible that the F-scribe, with *si quis* written plainly before him could take it down as Επισ. On the other hand, the origin of this monster lies naked to see. Indubitably the copy was made from an uncial *continuo scripta*, thus: ΕΙΤΙC. The I and T written close together very naturally fused into Π, from which they are often hardly distinguishable. Similarly in Rom. 7:19 and Eph. 6:9 G has correctly παρακειται and ποιείται, but F παρακεπαι and ποιεπαι.

⁷ That is, of course, in Scrivener's transcript.

Whether it was F* that made this mistake or F', the proximate ancestor of F, cannot be determined; but it is clear that F's text at this point was *not* taken from G. To clinch this proof with hooks of steel, we have procured through the kindness of Dr. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, director of the Royal Library in Dresden, a facsimile of the passage, which shows the $\epsilon\iota\tau\omega$ spaced as given above. "It is unmistakable that the copyist has intended to leave an interval free between $\epsilon\iota$ and $\tau\omega$."

On this single instance we are willing to rest our case, but even this is not all in these very lines. It is hard to believe that F would make two mistakes in the one word *ανεγκλητος*, putting κ and ϵ for γ and η , letters little alike in G: and whence comes the ' over α in *Μιδσ*? This latter is not a trifle. F would not have placed it there without some suggestion, and no suggestion can be found in G. But F very often circumflexes ι before α ; so then did his original. We may, indeed we must, suppose then that in the original the ι had a circumflex. But it was slightly misplaced and somewhat obscure; hence F has reproduced it mechanically as we now see it.

This page in fact abounds in proofs of F's independence of G. Thus, in vs. 3 we have in G *κατεπιταγην*, ^{*secundum praeceptum*} but in F *κατειπίξατην*—three variations in one word, none easy to explain. In the next line we have in G *σωτηρος*, ^{*saluatoris*} but in F *σωτησοσ*, ^{ρ} Correction has here been made, but how was the mistake made at first?

The fifth verse begins, after a blank space in G, with *Τουτον*; but F has, at the beginning of a line, no space being left, *οντον huius rei* ^{*huius rei*} This is an example of an oft-recurring phenomenon. Why is the T omitted, if F be copied from G? Can anyone suggest?

In the next line G has

qua deerant t minus sunt corriges
τα λειποντα δειορθωσησ;

but F

. . . . τα. λειπον. . . . ea quae desunt

τα. δειορθωσησ corrigas

Here F* has conceived *λειπον* as a word meaning "desunt" and the following *τα* as the article; also *δει* as a word, though this notion has been corrected. But how was it possible for him to fall into such conceits with the unequivocal G before him?

In vs. 7 G has again *ανεγκλητον*, but F *ανηγκλητον*; ^{ϵ} the itacism has been corrected, but why was it committed? In the same verse G has

λυθαδην, but F λυ^θδαδην. Here both have mistaken Α for Λ naturally enough, but G's Θ does not resemble his Α. F's second (corrected) mistake is one of ear, committed long before.

The next line G ends with Αλλα, and begins another with φιλοξενον; but F has

μη. αισχροκερδην. Αλλα. φι *sed* π *hospitatem* turbis lucri cupidum *sed* hospita.

Why does F tack on the syllable φι to a line already of ordinary length, if copying from G, in which φι begins a new line, especially since the corresponding Latin line, even after contraction, remains of extraordinary length? This is a very mild example of a procedure, as it seems, almost psychologically impossible, yet repeated scores of times.

At the close of the same verse G has *amplectentem eum t id* αντεχομενον, but F αντεχομην. Is it at all likely that the copyist would both mistake ε for Η and overlook ON entirely? We cannot believe it. But how did the mistake arise? We answer, far back among F's progenitors. There the ΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ was first mistaken for ΧΟΜΕΝΕΝ, as was easy; then the second ΕΝ was dropped by accident or design, as might very readily happen; then the ΕΝ was changed to ΗΝ, whether by mispronunciation, or by design, or otherwise. There is no reason to suppose F has not copied accurately. In this same vs. 8 G has σωφρονα, but F σωφρονα, the ο at the end of a line, where it is especially unlikely one would make a blunder, since a pause there would be natural, even necessary. Just here we may observe that the Latin in F is exquisitely written, and that the Greek uncials, though by an unpracticed hand, are traced with neatness and with apparently infinite care. The time, patience, and devotion required to make so many letters, one by one, with such delicacy and uniformity must have been exceeding great. It is well to remember these facts in estimating the charges of gross carelessness so often brought against the copyist.

On the preceding page, vs. 2, we find a series of notable divergencies: in G ζωησ, in F ξωησ, in G *quam* ΗΝ, in F αν, though G's Η has no likeness to his Α or Α; in G αψευστος, in F αψευτος; lastly, in G the whole space under επιδει (nearly an inch) and before ο αψευστος is left blank, but there is no corresponding blank in F. Above, in 2 Tim. 4:18 we have in G *caeleste cui* επουρανιον Ω, but in F ηπουρανιον. Ο; in G ΑΜΗΝ, but in F αμην.

This epistle closes in G and F thus :

explicit ad timotheum secunda
Ἐτελεσ Προς Τιμοθεον. . B. II.

EXPLICIT AD TIMOTHEUM. II. Ἐτελεσθη. προσ. τιμοθεον. B.

Here the small π and τ seem strange as taken from G; and did F know enough Greek to add θη? True, he might have turned back and found it in other subscriptions, but that would indicate great thoughtfulness and care, whereas the other variants would indicate the grossest unheed. This same minute attention would seem displayed in Tit.

1:11, where G has οἶκος, but F οικουσ. If copying from G, F* has noted the dot and the minute ι, the former of which has escaped the lynx-eyed Scrivener. How, then, could such a careful copyist blunder thus in vs. 9?

et contra dicentes revinceret contradic
εννουση. Και τους αντιλεγοντας ελεγ
sana et eos qui contra τη. υγει εννουση. και τουσαν

How could he possibly have torn away the σ from τους? How could he have prefixed it to αν?

In still further evidence of F's thoughtfulness, consider his καιροισ in Tit. 1:3. G has καιροις, but F* understands the και as the familiar conjunction. Afterward he or F** corrects this, but was not such a mistake absolutely impossible to a copyist of G? It is plain that F* *thought* in making the false division; thought wrongly, but still thought; for he did not feel sure about the division, and accordingly omitted the dot (.). We dwell on this, because someone might say that by this time F's brain is become as weary as his hand and fatigue of attention has set in. By no means, he is as careful as ever.

We have now considered one critical passage, Tit. 1:6, and we have furthermore seen that it is not to be regarded as some unaccountable exception, that it is by no means isolated, but is only one among many in its own immediate neighborhood, pre-eminent, but differing from the others in degree rather than in kind. We pass now to a second capital proof, itself the center of similars. In Tit. 2:3 we have:

similiter in habitu sancto
σχημα βυτειδασ ωσαντως εν Κατα στημα τι ιερο
R στημα αυτωσ. εν. κατα. σχηματι. ιερο *ter in habitu sancto*

Here it seems manifest that either G' or G'' presented the reading σχηματι, and that either G or G' made the marginal note of correction. (We take R to mean *Recte*—the glossist will say that σχημα in his text

should rightly be *σθημα*, but our argument does not depend upon this view.) If F copied from G, he must have mistaken the *τ* for *χ*, which is very improbable, since these letters are not at all alike in G; also he must have overlooked or misunderstood the marginal gloss, which is also extremely unlikely. Hence, at this point, G is not F's original. The only escape from this conclusion seems to lie in saying that F *did* misunderstand the gloss, that he thought G intended that *σχημα* should be put for *σθημα*, and accordingly did so. But such an evasion seems to be such a patent *pis aller* as to call for no consideration.

The environment of this passage furnishes the strongest corroboration of our position. Thus, in vs. 6 we read:

Τουσ νεωτερουσ κ.τ.λ.

Ουσ. νεωτερουσ *Juvenes*

Here the conspicuous capital initial T has been dropped, and the second letter *ο* capitalized instead. Is any natural explanation possible on the Hort-Zimmer hypothesis? Certainly not. It seems clear as the sun that F* is copying from a MS., F', in which the verse actually begins with O. But how did such a form originate? It was copied from another, F'', in which the verse begins with an uncial O, and the large T was carelessly omitted. How? The copyist had intended to put it before the normal line, as is regularly done in D, at the beginning of a paragraph, thus:

ΗΟΡΓΗΤΟΥΘΥΕΙCΤΕΛΟC

IRA*d*iusqueAdF*u*NEM

ΗΜΙCΔΕΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ

NOSA*u*T*em*FRAT*r*ES

ΑΤΤΟΡ

DESO

and in *ℵ*, thus:

CΤΙΛΑΥMIN

ΓΕΙΝΩCΚΕΤΕΤΟΝ

ΑΔΕΛΦΟΝΗΜΩΝ

On the next page (3:1) we find a similar case:

admone et illos

Υπομειμνησ και αυτουσ κ.τ.λ.

*a d mone illos p*ri*ncipibus πομειμνησ. και. αυτουσ. αρ.*

Here the capital Y has been omitted, and also the initial *A* in the Latin. But with this difference, that a space has been left for the *A*, but *none* for the Y. Could there be a plainer case of scrupulous fidelity? The text before the scribe contained neither the one capital nor the other; he felt the absence of the Latin initial, knowing of course *admone*, and left a space for it; but *not of the Greek*. And no

wonder; for the Greek *υπομειμνησκει* is a mystery to him (as also to G). Both think the final syllable *και(κε)* is the too familiar conjunction.

In the next line G uses a small letter *υ*, but F a capital *Υ* in *υποτασσεσθαι*. Why this latter, if F was copying G? In vs. 4 G has *Η φιαανθρωπῖα*, but F *ηφιαανθρωπῖα*. Here both mistake *Λ* for *Α*, and both place the circumflex over *ι*, this latter showing great care, if F be copying G; but F unaccountably decapitalizes the *Η* and unites it with the following. In vs. 7 is the remarkable *των.σ.τηροσ.*^ω The interlinear *ω* is *secunda manu*, but even if it were *prima*, how could this be a copy of the *σωτηροσ* of G?

Chap. 2 begins in G, plainly, with

tu autem loquere quae decet
Cυ δε λαλει Α πρεπει τη υγειεν . . .

How then could F* write

υδε; λαλει. απρεπει. τη. υ̃ *Tu autem loquere quae decet sa?*

Why the capital C omitted and no space left? Why the *δε* united with *υ*? Why the *α* with *πρεπει*? Why the letter *υ̃* at the end? Whence the semi-colon (;)? Is it not transparent that F is following his original closely, and that the original is *not* G?

At the close of 3:19 a small space is left in G, occupied by the two marks >>; but in F there is no space and no capital following. In vs. 6 G has *κεκρικα*, but F *κεκριτα*, though there is no resemblance in G between the letters interchanged. In vs. 13 G has quite unmistakably

apollo t apollinem sollicite praemitte
απολλωνα ταχαιωσ προπ'εμψον
ut nihil illis desit discant
ινα μηδεν αυτοις λειπη Μανθανετωσαν

But F

legis peritum et Apollo τον. νομικον. και. απολλω. να
sollicite praemitte. Ut ni ταχαιωσ. προπεμψον. ινα
hil illis desit. dis δεν. αυτοις. λειπη. μαν_θανε

Here the misunderstanding is really intense; for *on revision* the corrector has thought that *να* should go with *ταχαιωσ*! And this in the presence of G? The next line is even worse still; for not only have the capitals been neglected, but *μη* has been omitted inexplicably;⁸ also *μανθανετωσαν* has been misconceived as two words in spite of the *discant*.

⁸ We suspect that in F' or F" *ινα μη* was written at the end of a line thus: *INĀ.*

salutant

In vs. 15 G has *Ἀσπαζονται*, but F *σπαζονται*. It is quite unaccountable how F could have overlooked the large A and have fancied a division before ζ. This error has been corrected, which shows careful inspection, but the omission is left unsupplied. At the close G has *AMHN.*, but F *αμ.* True, this line is *overfull* by *υμων. αμ.*; but this circumstance only strengthens our suspicion that F is following his copy *exactly*; for there is no reason in F for this overcrowding; there is left a blank line at the foot of the page. We must seek the reason then in F'; there for lack of space, perhaps, the scribe was unwilling to give *υμων αμην* a distinct line, but forced it into a line before, by abbreviating *αμην* into *αμ.* F', then, could not have been G.

In Philem., vs. 1, we find in G and F:

<i>motheus</i>		<i>frater</i>	<i>philemoni</i>
μοθεος	ο	Ἀδελφος	φιλημονει
ιν. και. τειμοθει.		<i>ihu et timotheus</i>	
αδελφος. φιλημονει.		<i>frater philemoni</i>	

Here the F-text bears witness to an original that could not have been G. For who could mistake the *οσ* of G for *ι*? or have overlooked the wide-spaced *ο*? This letter in G is written slightly above the line *aliquantulum post, sed ab eodem scriba, ut videtur, insertum* — (Matthäi). Scrivener is inexact in saying *at forsan s. m.* The large space left blank, and the insertion a little later, show that there was some uncertainty or obscurity in the original of G. This fact is reflected in F very curiously and instructively. The *ο* is omitted, and the impossible genitive allowed to stand, in spite of the correct Latin nominative. Here, then, in the most obvious case, F* will not vary a hair's breadth from his original (as he reads it) to adapt his Greek to his Latin. In our judgment the explanation must be sought in tachygraphy, which in some way confused in the F scribe's mind the article *ο* and the ending *οσ*.

In vs. 2 F omits *τω*, perfectly evident in G, but retains *τη*, which in G is deleted by dots. This is very noteworthy, for the *τη* should be retained. If then F is copying from G, he is doing his work not only very cautiously, but with high intelligence. Nevertheless, in the next line F writes *εκκλησεια. χαρεισ* instead of G's *εκκλησια . . . χαρισ*, changing both spellings and omitting the dots, and in the next line *κν. ιν. χρν. νχαρειστω* instead of G's *κν. ιν. χρν. >> Ευχαρειστω*. Here the wide spacing in F points back to some primitive peculiarity not found in G; also the disregard of the >>'s shows that F' is not G; and

still more the omission of Ε. This letter must have begun a line in F' (as in F), as already explained, and have lost its place in the margin.

In vs. 5 F has *ηνεχεις* in lieu of G's *Ην εχεις* and in vs. 6 *ηκοινομια* in lieu of G's *η. κοινονια*. But in the same verse F has *ινα. πως* for G's

^{ut}
INαπως. Twice F has *σπανχνα* where G has *σπλανχνα*, but they both have *σπανχνα* once, vs. 20, which would show this latter to be a real manuscriptural form, and not a mere blunder of F's. In vs. 14 F omits *σησ* from before *γνωμησ*, though the word, being at the end of a line in G, could hardly have escaped his eye.

Si igitur

In vs. 17 G has *Ει ουν* near the middle of the line ; but F has *ι. ουν* (in the Latin *Si ergo*) at the beginning. Here once more the omission of the Ε implies that F is not copying G. In the next line G's >> are

^{mea}
disregarded. Lastly, in vs. 20 G has *μον. τα*, but F has *.μουτα*. How can all these things be, if F has G before him ?

If anyone repeats that the hand and sense and nerve of the scribe are now exhausted, and that he is capable of anything, we refer such a one to vs. 16,

jam non ut servum—sed pro servo ουκεται . ωσ . δουλων

in evidence that his eye is not dim nor his natural force abated. There is nothing in G to suggest such spacing, nevertheless there is plainly something wrong ; the ordinary text inserts *αλλα υπερ δουλων*, the Latin *sed pro servo*. F inserts nothing, and yet shows clearly that his text is

^{frater H. ai}
here disturbed. Notice again that in vs. 20 G has *αδελφε*, but F *αδελφαι*. Why this preference if F be copying G ? Is it either heedless or natural ?

However, we gladly consent to a change of venue. Let us appeal to the earlier parts of the codex. The case is not less clear. The first part preserved of F is fol. 7, p. 1, Rom. 3: 18-26. It seems impossibly taken from G, for at vs. 20 we read :

peccati nunc autem sine lege iustitia
αμαρτιασ. Νυν ιδε χωρισ νομου. Δικαιοσυ

== per fidem iesu christi in omnes et
νη θυ δια πιστεωσ ιην χρυ εισ παντας και
==
επι παντας. πεφανερωται. μαρτυρουμενη υπο

But in F,

αμαρτιασ.	peccati. ~~~~
Νυν. ιδε. χωρισ. νομου.	Nunc autem sine lege.
δι. και οσυνη. του. $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$	⁺ sine lege
$\pi^{\wedge}\epsilon^{\wedge}$ φανερωται. $\overset{f}{\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu}$	iustitia $\overline{d\iota}$

Here we note first the omission of a whole line; but someone will say that the critical marks suggested this omission, as well as the Latin. We deny this. The marks nowhere in G denote deletion or omission, which is always denoted by underscoring or under-dotting. The marks certainly indicate something peculiar, perhaps an intrusion from the margin in some ancestor of G, but there is no reason to believe they could have led F to leave out a whole line. Neither could his Latin text have done so, for, once again, he nowhere adapts his Greek to his Latin. This latter was disturbed at this point, as witness the repetition of *sine lege*, with the marks, but the appearance is that F has copied faithfully, even servilely.

Aside from this, however, what in G suggested the blank after αμαρτιασ? Nothing. And did F* insert του of his own accord? Incredible. For in G there is an erasure between νη and $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$, though not space for a του. This hints distinctly some obscurity in the original; perhaps the του was indistinctly present. Again, it is plain throughout the page that F is puzzled by the word δικαιοσυνη. He thinks the και is the well-known conjunction. In vs. 22 he again divides it at και, and again in vs. 26, and the cognate in vs. 24 thus: δι. και ου. μαινοι. The continual recurrence of δικαιο finally convinces him and in 4:3 he writes διακαιοσυνην! Moreover, F* or F** has then corrected these misdivisions by the hook \combar , and has proclaimed to posterity his grand discovery of the meaning of the word by putting the mark *f* over δικαιοσυνη and also over *iustitia* in vs. 22! Now we ask any unbiased mind: Was all or any of this confusion and long-enduring uncertainty and final illumination possible even to a casual reader of G, where the word is uniformly written as a unit with the Latin translation above it? Unquestionably, no!

On the next page, vs. 30, we find in G:

quoniam quidem t siquidem

Επει περ, εις, κ.τ.λ.; but in F, επε. υπερ.

Was such a perversion possible to a rational copyist? At the end of vs. 30, in G:

statuimus quid ergo

στανομεν. Τι ουν. κ.τ.λ.; but in F

statuimus;

στανομεν.

Qui d̄ ergo dicemus invenisse

Τι. ουν. ερουμεν. ευρηκεναι

Will anyone explain the blank space in this "photograph"? In G, on the other hand, there are four lacunae, indicated by the marks >>, >, >, >> (vss. 10, 27, 31), no trace of which has been preserved in F.

At 4:3 we read:

sed non apud ad deum quid enim

scriptura dicit

Αλλου προσ θν. Τι γαρ η. γραφη λεγει

gloriam. sed non apud dm̄

καυχημα. αλλα ου προσ θν.

· H ·

Quid enim scriptura dicit. credi

Τι. γαρ. γραφη. λεγει. πιστευ

Is it the least likely, is it even possible, for F to have copied Αλλου as αλλα ου, having scarcely any knowledge of Greek, when even the corrector still conceives the two as one word? Again, even if he may have overlooked the η, would anyone correcting by G have inserted it as H?

In G there are lacunæ at vss. 6 and 12, occupied by >>>> and >>. Naught of the kind in F. At vs. 8 we have:

beatus vir cui
Μακαριος ανηρ ου

imputabit dominus peccatum

beatitudo

ου μη λογεισθται κσ αμαρτιαν

>> Ο. μακαρισ

ω. ου μη. λογεισθται κσ. α

cui non imputabit dñs pec

catum

catum

Ο μακαρισμος. ουν. αυτους. επι.

eatitudo ergo haec in

Can anyone doubt that F is here following the pattern before him? Something more than the >> of G must have determined the paragraph, for elsewhere such signs, even in larger numbers, have no effect on F. Who believes that F was strong enough in Greek to correct G's ου into ω? Certainly not we. And why the letter α detached from its word, and at the end of a line? Again, the omission of B from the last line shows plainly that F was copying from a Latin codex in which the division into paragraphs had already been made and signaled by large marginal letters; one of these, B, had been inadvertently dropped.

· ubi

In vs. 15 G has Που, but F που. G's original must have had the Π, for he would not arbitrarily change Ου into Που; but for some reason the Π was afterward deleted. One may say that F* did not observe the dots; however, they are very plain to see, and it is unlikely he would fail to note them here on a capital, if everywhere else he noted them on small letters.

Vs. 18 is remarkable:

dictum est sic erit semen tuum
ειρημενον. >> Ουτως εσται το. σπερμα σου
d÷

ὡς αἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐνοῦ

και :

sicut stellae caeli και : το αμμον της θαλασσης *et non infirmatus*
και μνησθηνσας

But in \mathbf{F} ,

ειρημενον. οὕτως. εἶπαι.	<i>dictum est ei. sic erit</i>
το. σπέρμα. <u>σου</u> . ὡς. αἱ.	<i>semen tuum sicut</i>
αστερες. του. <u>οὐνου</u> . και. το.	<i>stellae caeli et</i>
αμμου της θαλασσης	<i>arena maris.</i>
και. μη. ασθενησας. εν. τη	<i>Et non infirmatus in</i>
πιστι. ουκ. ατεν ^ο . ησεν. το	<i>fide non consideravit</i>

This passage seems to prove nothing either one way or another, but it is too interesting to omit. In G there seems to have been an influx from the margin; the α may indicate that the Greek is a translation of the Latin; the d+ of course means "wanting," but we are not certain what or where; altogether, the confusion is almost inextricable. But there is no trace of it in F. On the other hand, notice how improbable his word-division in the last line is, if he be transcribing from G. True, he might have guessed at $\sigma\upsilon\kappa$ as the equivalent of *non*; but why omit the σ ? Why put the dot in its place? Is this photograph exact?

[To be concluded.]